5/23/75

Dear Paul,

I'm glad my last letter crossed yours of the 18 - that you came to realize on your own part of what I'd written you.

It is virtually impossible on this subject to be honest and straightforward without appearing to be a nut, vindictive, jealous and/or a number of other unpleasant things.

In your letter you mention names, events and "investigators" as though all are one. You'll learn that you did not name one real investigator.

The best of them are nuts. The others are more dangerous and hurtful if not really sinister.

Collectively, as you will also learn, almost none of them has done any work at all, the few who are not entirely disreputable have done nothing of consequence, and the rest merely have. Sometimes with seeming lucidity, sometimes appealingly but utterly irresponsibly and unfactually.

If Freed and O'Toole were interesting in pursuing Mac with you it was for selfish reaons. This is my estimate of both. I agree with your comments on both.

Now that you have said what you think of Freed, let me present a different problem to you because it is outside my experience and may be costly to me/

Quite some time ago he started talking to me about a movie of what I've done on the King/Ray case. Repeated references to a quarter of a million dollars. It went slowly, with explanations generally in terms of problems with financing. Then this problem did not exist and there was a contract offered. It had the net effect of tying me up indefinitely for a pittance and the pie in the sky was in terms of percentages of the meaningless and what I also assume what can be manipulated. I kept asking for a guaranteed minimum and finally in January Freed wrote that he agreed, finding this reasonable, and would be in touch. Since silence.

Then there is this "left wing" conference - how else would any paper describe that mixture - and Freed pretty much ran it, assured that Lane would again be the only keynoter, and saw to it that I was not invited. Meanwhile, when they wanted rich nuts they wrote offering expenses. Lane is terrified of an appearance with me because he really knows little of the subject and cares less and has had repeated experiences of my correcting his serious errors that really are no better than the cheapest kinds of anti-government manufactures. Simple factual error, his hallmark, I always ignore. He doesn't really know the basic fact or the basic fact of the official mythology. But he and Freed appear to remain close since they jointly and successfully ripped of a French spook black book and raked it in with Executive Action. Originally Farewell America, in turn once America Burns.

I can understand that Freed would want his showman friend and associate and that this could discourage inviting me. But for the King part too, another day and a different building? When I'm supposed to be the source and subject of his Movie? Nay, even hero?

I have written Don and asked for him to lay it all out, clearly and uniquivocally. I do not really expect an answer. I do think he is off on a plagiarism, possibly having seen how he thinks he can by-pass me.

Wakeford-Orloff was also off on a similar kick, after I'd agreed to deal with them, which was before Freed spoke to me. He and they had some kind of falling out over Executive Action and they had a falling out with a guy they had "researching" or whatever other polite designation is given to plagiarizing. They are suing each other, as of my last information.

The whole thing is quite outside my experience and broke as I am outside my immediate capability of coping with. So, I ask if you have any suggestions or know anyone who would be interested in what by orthodox Hollywood standards and in the strictest Establishmentarian terms would make a movie.

Both. Safeguarding my rights and using them and the work.

The past 11 years have brought much disappointment, much learning and the kinds of surprises that at any age I'd never have expected. Among these most prominent in my mind now is what lousy businessmen most in all forms of communication really are. Take teats and hackneyed formulae away and they are lost. Wave gold in their faces and they see brass. Show they profitability and they see red.

The whole thing is so unreal!

The subjects with which I deal and have done virtually all the original work, as by now you must at least have a glimmer, are going crazy. In the middle of the preceeding graf I got a call from a Nashville radio station. They'll air me cold in 20 minutes. Nashville, where the State DA and Ray are? Where that subject is most taboo? Not a college or an FM station. The leading area talk show.

Two days ago, by invitation, I spent several hours with the representatives of conservative Congressmen of both parties, in the House office building, plus one I take to be a new liberal. It began when one took in my NYC press conference of 4/25/75, when I had pneumonia and pleurisy and a fever of 102. It lasted two hours, without a single nasty question, made the wires, and the CBS NYC net radio station used sections of the whole tape around the clock, hourly, the first day and repeatedly less frequently for the next five or six. (Establishmentarian enough?) After that I was asked to write a position paper for them and to recommend others who could be trusted to be responsible by those not hep in the field. Before I left that meeting these legislative experts agreed to a needed amendment in the resolution one Member had already introduced. (You can have in in their handwriting if you want.) Can anything be more respectable and Establishmentarian? Or better credentials?

Besides this and what I think are obviously safe approaches to a subject that is and will be hot, your people either don't read papers or can't understand anything other than Sam Goldwyn sans $$signs.

(Conservatives are coming up tomorrow. Just called.)

The whole thing, the prevailing attitudes, are to me just plain crazy.

There is not in my mind any question is this going to come apart. The questions are when and how. It can be any day. With luck I'll do it soon in court. But my history and your experience tells me not to depend on either luck or justice.

I am further baffled when I think of all the rich Democrats out there and our first unelected President who was part of the whole wretched business, the Republican President who alone commercialized his obligation and then perjured himself about it.

I was interrupted hours ago but I feel I should address your "I feel what is coming out will give a boost to the publishing of your book." If anything that is factual and meaningful has "come out" in years that is not my work I'm unaware of it. You are talking about talkers when you refer to "investigators." They do no work. They use what they can, entirely indiscriminately. To date the net effect is good on popular reaction but potentially deadly. The Rockefeller Commission's major investigative effort has been to prepare an overkill case on all this fabrication and insanity. It will be effective. I am taking what steps I can, in my own way, to try to do what can offset this. If you or the people you are talking to doubt for a minute my analysis and judgement on this, call me up, tape it and see how close I am when that report

comes out in two weeks.

You also say Mark Lane had "copies from the Archives" of the transcript I just shook loose. Wrong, whether you assumed this or he said it. I gave them away, xeroxes, 4/25/75 at the NYU conference when I held my press conference and gave the sponsors copies and permission to give them to anyone and everyone. Lane knew this and undoubtedly got them there. No reason why he should not have. But I'll bet you that when he mentioned this and the other transcript he never mentioned my name or the only book with the longer one, and there is a least a better than 50% chance that his formulation made it appear that he had done this and about all the other work.

You will learn that it is not ego-tripping when I tell you that what is coming out is all by one means if it is good and is going to be ruinous if it is of any other origin.

It is easy to make it appear that one has ended suppression because of the covering letters from the Archives with which they are sent. An example of this day before yesterday. The first copy I was provided of the 1/22 transcript, the one just reported, was of poor quality and cropped, whether or not accidentally. I asked my lawyer to ask them for a full and clear copy. We got it. It was charged to my account. He also gave copies to anyone who wanted them. One of these self-promoters, not knowing that these Congressional people had been in touch, sent a copy of the clearer one with his own letter stapled to it to the Member in whose office we met. His administrative assistant is a former reporter and is sharp. He already knew the story and he realized that this was one of the typos who do these unethical things. So, he gave the member the poorer copy which shows its origin and how it got declassified and kept the other copy for himself. He showed it to me.

There is jealousy, more than normal. But mostly there is also badmouthing and it has chiefly one purpose: the self-seekers ruining the reputations of the few who do the work they use without credit or permission.

There is a safe rule of thumb for you: the more you hear the less the chance that the one you hear knows what he is talking about. There has even been a monopoly on who can be heard. The LA conference is an example. Not just with me. How about all the magnificient legal work Jim Lesar has done? Precedents, too.

Your optimism and mine are different. Mine has to do with the factual situation I am building and what in the changed climate can be done with it, given a chance. Yours confuses between popular sentiment and what can be done where the decisions are made, where the power is. Before I can share yours, much as I'd like to, we have to get past the Rockefeller Report and what can follow it.

Again thanks. If I were without hope I'd not be doing what I'm doing. There is hope. But one of the real problems is that the people who want to help or can are the creatures of their own isolation from reality and those who invent it.

Sincerely,